

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under § 112. Applicants traverse this rejection because the claims clearly identify one transaction which updates the source databases. For example, in Fig. 9 of the present specification, a transaction T1 updates several columns of DBa and DBb. In transaction T2, the same or other columns are separately updated. The independent claims correctly provide that a single transaction (e.g., T1 or T2) separately updates plural source databases. Accordingly, withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of McCurdy et al. '697 and Yamaguchi et al. '598. Independent claims 1, 3 and 5 have been amended to better define the present invention over the cited references, without narrowing the scope of the claims, and applicants traverse for the reasons given in Amendment A, and the following reasons.

The independent claims now more clearly explain that when distributing journals to destination databases, the journals are distributed in units of transactions by distributing the journals corresponded with the transaction identification information, thereby maintaining consistency among databases. With this invention, applicants solved the problem of maintaining consistency among plural destination databases by assigning a transaction identification number for each updating transaction (applied to multiple source databases), and performing the other functions recited in the claims.

McCurdy et al. do not address this problem, as the examiner apparently recognizes. Indeed, McCurdy merely assigns numbers to electronic documents. The

documents are fixed, so they are not updated, as in the present invention. Thus, McCurdy et al. do not address the problem solved by applicants. In fact, McCurdy et al. have no incentive or motivation to update their existing files.

Yamaguchi et al. update replicated databases when a storage unit is removed. Yamaguchi et al. appear to perform the updating process through transactions containing a single up-date (see transaction “A” and transaction “B” in Fig. 5 of Yamaguchi et al.). The present invention performs the updating process by using transactions that may contain multiple updates. Each of these transactions is identified by a single transaction identification number.

Thus, neither reference, alone or in combination, recognizes applicants’ solution to the problem of maintaining consistency among destination databases, and neither reference enjoys the benefits of applicants’ invention. Among other things, the present invention avoids a complicated logical process or a delay of transaction processing time in maintaining this consistency, as described, for example, in paragraph 24 of the present published specification. Moreover, the cited references do not provide an implicit or explicit suggestion or motivation to modify their disclosures to derive the present invention. For these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

New claims 6, 7, and 8 have been added, and provide that when distributing journals to destination databases, the journals corresponding to the transaction identification

information are distributed in the order of the update, thereby maintaining consistency among databases, and also maintaining consistency of the order of updates. Applicants submit that this claim is also allowable, which is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

May 21, 2007

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978